DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 873 VT 007 815

TITLE	Transferring Military Experience to Civilian Jobs. A Study of Selected Air Force Veterans. Manpower/Automation Research Monograph No. 8.
INSTITUTION	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 68
NOTE	38p.
AVAILABLE FRCM	Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.00
DESCRIPTORS	Career Planning, *Job Skills, *Military Training, *Occupational Surveys, Professional Occupations, Profile Evaluation, Questionnaires, Semiskilled Occupations, Technical Occupations, *Transfer of Training

ABSTRACT

While most servicemen have no trouble finding employment in the current booming job market, they often find themselves taking jobs beneath their highest skill levels, a loss not only to them but to their employers. Those whose military service was in non-technical jobs often can find jobs only at the beginners level and even those may be hard to come by. This doctoral study investigated the extent to which military experience contributed to the qualifications of the civilian applicant and helped him get the job, and the contribution his skills made to the actual performance of the job once hired. Of the officers questioned, 64 percent said that their military service had helped "somewhat" or "a great deal" while 13 percent felt that it had been of "no help" or a "hindrance." Of the crafts group of enlisted men, 30 percent reported it had "helped a great deal." Approximately 40 percent of both officers and enlisted men said there was no need for the military training and experience in the performance of their jobs. Copies of the full dissertation upon which this report is based are available as PB 177 372 from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Education, Springfield, Virginia 22151. (CH)

TRANSFERRING MILITARY EXPERIENCE TO CIVILIAN JOBS

A Study of Selected Air Force Veterans

ED042873

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR / Manpower Administration

MANPOWER/AUTOMATION RESEARCH - MONOGRAPH NO. 8

VT007815

ED042873

Manpower/Automation Research
Monograph No. 8
October 1968

TRANSFERRING MILITARY EXPERIENCE TO CIVILIAN JOBS

A Study of Selected Air Force Veterans

Based on "An Examination of the Transferability of Certain Military Skills and Experience to Civilian Occupations," A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Cornell University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, by Robert Brooks Richardson, September 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Willard Wirtz, Secretary

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Manpower Administrator

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PREFACE

This is the first summary of a dissertation to be published under the Doctoral Dissertation Grants Program of the Manpower Administration.

That program was established under the 1965 amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which authorized the Department of Labor to give grants for the support of manpower research. As an incentive for scholars in the behavioral sciences to specialize in the manpower field, this program supports doctoral candidates writing their dissertations on manpower topics. Since the first grant was awarded in October 1965, more than 90 doctoral candidates have been given support, and 14 have completed and submitted their dissertations.

This publication deals with one of these dissertations which was singled out because the research findings are significant for manpower programs or policies. Similar presentations of other dissertations will be published from time to time, and periodically brief summaries of other dissertations will be issued.

The full text of all these dissertations may be purchased from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information. (See p. 37 for a list of those now available and directions for ordering.) Microfilms of most of the dissertations may also be obtained through University Microfilms, Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
THE PROBLEM	3
THE NEWLY DISCHARGED VETERAN: A PROFILE	5
MILITARY TRAINING AND JOBS	7
Training for the Men in the Study	7
Job Success	8
THE EX-SERVICEMAN AS A CIVILIAN EMPLOYEE	9
The Hunt for a Job	9
On the Job	10
HOW WELL ARE MILITARY SKILLS BEING TRANSFERRED TO CIVILIAN OCCUPATIONS?	13
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE COMPLETION OF THE STUDY	17
APPENDIX	21
The Sample Group	23
Limitations of the Study	25
Questionnaire	27
DISSERTATIONS PREPARED UNDER RESEARCH GRANTS	37

INTRODUCTION

Until World War II, service in the Armed Forces provided little experience and training that could be carried over into civilian employment, but since then the onrush of technology has transformed our fighting force into a military machine whose mainstay is the skilled technician. As a result, for all services combined, the enlisted force requires three mechanics or technicians for every man in ground combat, and the number of highly skilled electronics repairmen alone exceeds the number of infantrymen (as of 1963).

Because of its increasingly technological nature, the military finds it necessary to work closely with civilian industry in the research, development, and production of its hardware. Armed Forces personnel must therefore become familiar with the installation, operation, maintenance, and occasionally the actual manufacture of complex systems and equipment. Both sectors thus find themselves using many of the same or related procedures, techniques, and occupational skills, and since a great majority of the men in the Armed Forces return to civilian employment, the question arises: Can they transfer their military-acquired skills and experience to civilian jobs?

Major Robert B. Richardson, a U.S. Air Force officer for 15 years and recently returned to active duty, tries to answer this question in a doctoral dissertation entitled "An Examination of the Transferability of Certain Military Skills and Experience to Civilian Occupations." This study was undertaken on a grant from the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, and completed in September 1967. Major Richardson confined his study to a group of Air Force men who had left the service in 1965 and 1966, after meeting their minimum service obligation—usually a 4-year term. The study group was made up of two categories of officers: one, of men assigned to scientific-engineering duties and the other, to administrative work; and two categories of enlisted men: a technical-craftsmen group and a nontechnical (military services) group. (See appendix for explanation of how and why the study group was chosen, and a list of the specific occupational specialties included.)

Using an extensive questionnaire (see appendix), Major Richardson surveyed the problems connected with the men's transition from military service to civilian employment—starting with their preservice background and continuing on through their military experience, postdischarge job hunt, and various aspects of the jobs they found. His chief interest was the degree to which they were able to transfer their military skills and experience.

His findings are presented here because they help to fill a large gap in our knowledge of manpower and contain some clues to improving the way in which we use our manpower resources. Like the results of any statistical study, his findings need to be examined from the perspective of certain limitations on the scope of the data and the methods of collecting and analyzing them. (These limitations are described in the appendix.) For example, his study was limited to specified occupational specialties

in the Air Force, and the experience of the men in these specialties may not represent the experience either of other Air Force personnel or of men in other branches of the Armed Forces. Moreover, since the men in his study left the Air Force in 1965 and 1966, their experience would not necessarily parallel the experience of men leaving the service—even from comparable Air Force jobs—in 1968. Today's new veterans might encounter somewhat different economic conditions in the communities to which they return, and they certainly could count on more assistance in readjusting to civilian life if they desired it. Developments in the latter area since the completion of the study are outlined in the last chapter of this monograph.

THE PROBLEM

The recent growth of our Armed Forces augurs a corresponding rise in the number of men leaving the service. At the time Major Richardson made his study, he estimated the discharge rate to be at least a half million a year. Defense Department figures indicate that it will be 830,000 in 1968; 840,000 in 1969; and 970,000 in 1970.

Richardson noted that, despite their numbers, there was little information about, and interest in, the employment and other transition problems of newly discharged ex-servicemen. For example, in 1964, the Assistant Secretary for Defense (Manpower) indicated to a Senate Committee that the Defense Department had no comprehensive statistics on the nature of civilian employment for men discharged from the service. Research had been focused on the problems of the much smaller group of men retiring from the service after 20 or more years.

In view of the many programs to better utilize our human resources and manpower, the slight attention given such a large body of men prior to enactment of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 is surprising. Not only did such lack of attention give our manpower planners an incomplete picture and diminish their effectiveness, but it also was damaging to the men themselves. The economy suffered, too.

Some parts of the country have critical shortages of blue-collar workers which technically trained veterans could undoubtedly fill. Jobs in the higher brackets—administrative, managerial, scientific, or engineering—for which numerous officers could qualify, also go begging. While most servicemen have no trouble finding employment in the current booming job market, they often find themselves taking jobs beneath their highest skill levels, a loss not only to them but to their employers. And one sizable group, those whose military service was in nontechnical jobs, often can find jobs only at the beginner's level, and even those may be hard to come by.

This is the problem to which Richardson addresses himself—a problem that should be of interest and concern to labor, management, manpower planners, veterans' organizations, and the growing force of discharged servicemen. Still another group should be vitally interested, too. Unless the present world political climate improves drastically, a term of military service will probably continue to figure in the future of most young American males. Will it be a 2-, 3-, or 4-year hiatus in their career plans? Or can it be made to serve as part of those plans?

THE NEWLY DISCHARGED VETERAN: A PROFILE

Following is a composite description of the men in Richardson's study group.

The typical enlisted man was about 24, had graduated from high school, and may have done some college work. He had served in the Air Force 4 years and was returning to his hometown after discharge. More often than not, he was unmarried. Most enlisted men planned to look for a job as soon as they got home. Nearly half had worked before going into service and, if they had a skill, would perhaps go back to their former jobs. Most, however, were students prior to entering service and would be seeking their first civilian jobs. Their fathers had usually held blue-collar jobs in processing, bench work, and structural trade work.

The typical officer in Richardson's study was about 27. He had completed college before entering service and may have done some graduate work. He, too, had served 4 years. He was married and had at least one child. He intended to live in the part of the country where he was born. Two out of three were students with no work experience when they entered the Air Force. More than half had been in the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps. Those in the scientific-engineering skills cluster had usually majored in physical science or engineering; those in managerial-administrative assignments had taken their college work in business, social science, humanities, or arts. Their fathers were likely to be employed in the managerial-administrative, professional-technical, and sales fields; were in the middle or upper socio-economic bracket; and could usually afford to send their children to college. For both groups of men, the data suggest that the father's occupation had some influence on the career choice of the son.

There was a small sampling of nonwhites in the survey—2.5 percent of the officers and 5 percent of the enlisted men, compared with a reported enrollment of 1.2 percent and 9.1 percent, respectively, for the Air Force as a whole. While their patterns were generally the same as for the whites, the Negroes tended to be slightly better educated, especially in the enlisted group, and had pursued their postdischarge education more assiduously than the whites.

Most of the men in the study group did not intend to make a career of the Air Force. The officers in the group had chosen the Air Force simply as the preferred way to meet their military obligation. Only 25 percent were interested in aviation and only 15 percent had picked the Air Force because it offered a chance for education and training. Almost half of the enlisted group, on the other hand, selected the Air Force because they felt it would provide a good opportunity to learn a usable occupational skill. Indeed, recruiting promotion aimed at high school graduates features the job-training and career opportunities of the service. Next to avoiding the draft, this was probably their strongest reason for joining. An examination of how the Armed Forces trains and assigns its personnel should reveal whether their expectations were realized.

MILITARY TRAINING AND JOBS

The defense establishment spends about $3 billion a year on education and training. One-third of this amount is spent on technical training for enlisted personnel, given in more than 2,000 different technical courses, from auto mechanics to aerospace technology, lasting from 2 weeks to a year. In 1963, more than 370,000 men completed such courses. Educators generally agree that the quality of the training, as measured by teaching aids, textbooks, teacher preparation, educational research, and classroom procedures, compares favorably with that of corresponding civilian schools, even though many of the mechanical and technical courses are more specialized and narrower in scope. Because of the limited training time available, the theoretical material may be curtailed in order to concentrate on the more immediate aspects of job specialty. Some of the advanced courses, lasting for a year or more, are on a par with those offered in many technical institutes and junior colleges.

Technical training for officers is organized on an extensive scale, also. Courses are given in more than 100 broad occupational fields and in as many as 1,000 specialized areas.

On the basis of numbers of men trained, money spent, and scope, the Armed Forces can be considered the largest training institution in the country. The Air Force alone runs five technical schools, offers up to 3,000 courses worldwide, and has 130,000 instructors. For enlisted men, training is available in 46 major career fields. In its 20 years of operation, the Air Force has conducted courses for over 7 million people.

Training for the Men in the Study

New Air Force officers and enlisted men are usually placed in a training course for the occupational field to which they have been assigned. Most of the men in the study group, 60 percent of the officers and 78 percent of the enlisted men, reported that they had attended such a course—one directly related to their subsequent occupational specialty in the vast majority of cases. There was some fallout in the enlisted group, however, probably because of voluntary transfer to another field.

Among the officer group, half of the men with scientific-engineering academic backgrounds were assigned directly to a job without attending a training course, probably because their college training was considered sufficient to handle the job. The same was true of the officers assigned to administrative duties, since their jobs did not require special training. Among the six career fields represented in the officer group, the proportion receiving related training ranged from about one-third in

the scientific-engineering and administration-information specialties to three-fifths or more in communications-electronics and material-finance. For the officers then, usable training came more from on-the-job experience than from formal courses. Much of it was acquired during administrative or managerial tours of duty, on which they had a chance to handle important projects, substantial numbers of men, and much equipment. As comparatively young men, they might not have been given such responsibility in civilian jobs.

Of the enlisted men, those assigned to technical occupations generally attended a training course: 70 percent in the crafts-firemen specialties and about 85 percent in both missile electronics and weapons maintenance. No more than two-fifths of those with nontechnical assignments, however, received related training, with the exception of those in aircrew protection. Men assigned as transportation workers or cooks were least apt to receive training. They were probably assigned these jobs because they showed the least aptitude and therefore needed skill training the most. This was the group which, upon separation, found difficulty in getting satisfactory jobs because they had no marketable skill.

Job Success

For the most part, the men's training and experience did not fulfill their expectations. Their disappointment is evident in some of their replies to questions about what contributed to success on the job. On their Air Force jobs, here is how the men rated various factors:

Formal schooling was considered very or most important to performance of the job by about 40 percent of both enlisted men and officers. About 21 percent of the enlisted men in the nontechnical military services rated education of no importance, a reply to be expected from those performing semiskilled jobs.

Job knowledge was considered absolutely essential or very necessary by 85 percent of the enlisted group and by 75 percent of the officers.

Working well with others was thought to be more important by the officers, particularly the administrative-managerial group, than by the enlisted men—a natural reflection of the characteristics of their respective jobs.

Communicative skills—ability to speak and write well—got the expected high rating from officers, who must use these skills constantly. The enlisted men attached some importance to them, too.

Knowing the "politics" of the unit was not highly valued by either group. The replies seemed to indicate that the men considered doing a good job more important than knowing the right people.

Utilization of their skills and abilities did not bring the USAF a high rating from either group. Only one-third replied that the Air Force used their skills "a great deal," while one-fifth of the officers and nearly one-third of the enlisted men said "very little" or "not at all."

Administrative ability understandably, was not regarded as highly by the enlisted men as by the officers, again reflecting the different duties of the two groups.

From these replies, Richardson concluded that the factors for job success in the USAF are not too different from those generally considered as contributors to civilian job success.

THE EX-SERVICEMAN AS A CIVILIAN EMPLOYEE

The Hunt for a Job

To have a job waiting when they got out of service seemed like a good idea to most of the men—but not all. Almost half of the officers started their job hunt 6 months or more before their separation date; another one-fifth, 3 to 6 months before. Less than half of the enlisted men made any plans 3 or more months ahead of the date. Another 15 percent were going back to the jobs they had before entering service. A good portion, 29 percent, made no plans at all.

A look at table 1 shows how they went about finding a job. The officers most frequently mailed résumés to firms they considered as possible employers, applied personally, or relied on friends for leads. Among the enlisted men, the principal jobseeking methods were personal applications, answering "Help Wanted" advertisements, and asking friends for job leads. No more than a third—and in most instances considerably fewer—of either group used the services of employment agencies and similar organizations. The agency most often used by enlisted men was the State Employment Service, whereas officers relied most heavily on college placement services and private employment agencies.

TABLE 1. METHODS OF SEEKING CIVILIAN JOB
(Percent distribution)

Job-seeking methods, agencies	Officers					Enlisted Men				
	Total	Used heavily	Used somewhat	No use	No response	Total	Used heavily	Used somewhat	No use	No response
Veterans' organizations	100.0	0	.2	93.9	5.9	100.0	.2	3.3	92.6	3.8
Religious groups	100.0	1.4	.7	92.0	5.9	100.0	0	1.0	95.5	3.6
Labor unions	100.0	0	0	93.6	6.4	100.0	1.4	4.8	90.0	3.8
Mailing résumés	100.0	44.3	19.1	30.7	5.9	100.0	9.6	12.9	73.4	4.1
Military friends	100.0	2.3	15.9	75.7	6.1	100.0	3.8	9.1	83.3	3.8
Other friends	100.0	13.0	28.2	52.3	6.6	100.0	12.7	31.8	51.4	4.1
Answering ads	100.0	10.9	23.2	60.0	5.9	100.0	20.1	23.9	52.2	3.8
Private employment services	100.0	8.4	14.3	71.1	6.1	100.0	3.3	5.7	86.8	4.1
U.S. Employment Service	100.0	1.6	7.5	84.5	6.4	100.0	6.0	17.2	72.7	4.1
College placement offices	100.0	9.3	18.9	65.5	6.4	100.0	1.9	1.4	92.6	4.1
Personal application	100.0	43.4	23.2	27.0	6.4	100.0	47.1	18.7	30.1	4.1

Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

The group did not make much use of professional counseling either. Sixty percent of the officers and 44 percent of the enlisted men did not believe it was needed. Of those who wanted such help, 25 percent of the officers and 38 percent of the enlisted men did not get any, however. Sixty-five percent of the enlisted group and 40 percent of the officers thought that USAF preseparation counseling sessions would have been a good idea. Both groups would have welcomed information on job availability; about half said they needed much more information than they got.

Would postdischarge vocational training have been of any help in getting a job? More than three-fourths of the enlisted men but only three-tenths of the officers thought so. As it turned out, about one-fourth of each group did take some training—the officers mainly in professional, technical, managerial, and sales fields and the enlisted men in machine trades, bench work, and structural work. The surprising finding here was the large number of both officers and enlisted men in the technically skilled groups who took training.

Why did the skilled groups find additional training necessary? For the officers, most of it consisted of indoctrination to acquaint them with company equipment and procedures, which may have involved new application of old skills. New skills were seldom taught. The enlisted men generally received training in new but related skills. For example, an Air Force-trained electronics specialist took a. 6-week course to become a production control specialist for a company manufacturing electrical and electronics products. Without his military skill, he could not have qualified that fast.

At the time of the study, the unemployment rate was quite low and jobs were plentiful. Seventy-five percent of both groups said they expected to find jobs easily and did. Even the nonskilled enlisted men had little trouble finding employment—probably because they took the first jobs available. These were usually in low-paying service occupations, a relatively easy field to enter in good times. Only 20 percent of each group, officers and enlisted men, reported any difficulty.

On the Job

Upon discharge, 85 percent of the group went to work and only 15 percent to school, either full or part time. The small number returning to school may be due in part to the hiatus in veterans' educational benefits between January 1965, when the program for Korean veterans expired, and June 1966, when peacetime veterans became eligible for educational assistance under the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. Moreover, most of the officers in this study had probably received stu-

TABLE 2. EXPANDED PRIMARY AIR FORCE SPECIALTY
(Percent

Civilian occupation	Officers—Expanded Primary Air Force Specialty Code[1]						
	Scientific–engineering	Communication–electronics	Aircraft maintenance	Civil engineering	Material–finance	Administration–information	Total
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional, technical	71.6	63.8	52.2	85.0	21.6	31.6	48.6
Managerial, administrative	16.2	23.4	17.4	10.0	55.0	44.9	33.4
Clerical, sales	5.4	6.4	8.7	---	12.6	15.3	9.3
Service	---	---	4.3	---	1.8	2.0	1.1
Farming, forestry	1.4	1.1	8.7	---	---	---	.9
Processing	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Machine trades	---	---	---	2.5	---	---	.2
Bench work	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Structural work	---	---	---	2.5	.9	1.0	.7
Transportation, miscellaneous	5.4	5.3	8.7	---	8.1	5.2	5.7

[1] The Air Force Specialty Code is the classification scheme used to designate the skills and skill levels of Air Force personnel. Each member is assigned one or more of these codes, denoting his primary, secondary, and other skills. The skill ranking depends on such factors as

dent deferments to complete college before entering the service.

Of the officer group, engineers, scientists, and others technically trained found jobs in those fields, as would be expected. However, from 10 to 25 percent accepted managerial and administrative positions, thus taking advantage of their military experience. Of 20 officers qualified as pilots, only seven took such jobs with commercial airlines. While some of the others may have been effectively barred by seniority rules, they were probably able to qualify for technical, managerial, or administrative positions because of their military experience in those fields.

The enlisted men took a wide variety of jobs, with some concentration in the machine trades, bench work, clerical-sales jobs, and structural work.

Table 2 compares the study group's occupations at the time of separation with the civilian jobs held when the study was made.

How stable were the ex-servicemen as civilian employees? Did they job-hop? Would their records make them good risks for employers? Richardson found that three-quarters of the officers had held only one job since they had left the service. For the enlisted men, the picture was somewhat different. While 60 percent of the technically trained men had also worked on only one job, 50 percent of the nonskilled men had had two or more, a few as many as five. The figures indicated that the higher the skill, the greater the stability, and also the lower the educational level, the more frequent the job hopping.

More than 80 percent of the men were satisfied with their current jobs. Of those interested in making a change, the officers wanted more responsibility, a greater challenge, and more money. The enlisted men were looking for more money, an opportunity to learn a new skill, and greater security, in that order.

Most of the officers and enlisted men took jobs with large companies (over 1,000 employees) engaged in manufacturing, sales, or service. The jobs were on the lower organizational levels of their companies—about the level of their service jobs and about where young men of their age would be expected to place. About 1 out of 8 were in government civil service jobs. Only 3 percent were self-employed.

The average annual income of the officers was about $10,000; of the enlisted men, about $6,500. (See table 3.) Officers with scientific-engineering background were getting $1,300 a year more than those who had worked in administrative jobs. Similarly, enlisted men from crafts-technical jobs were earning about $650 more than those from the nontechnical military services. Surprisingly, a majority of the

CODE[1] VS. CURRENT CIVILIAN OCCUPATION
distribution)

Enlisted Men—Expanded Primary Air Force Specialty Code[1]							Civilian occupation
Missile electronics	Weapons maintenance	Crafts–fire protection	Transportation–cooks	Service occupations	Air crew protection	Total	
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	Total
19.3	21.3	3.3	7.9	15.7	11.8	12.9	Professional, technical
6.1	8.2	2.5	10.5	7.8	8.8	6.2	Managerial, admin.
8.8	6.6	15.0	23.7	19.6	23.5	14.1	Clerical, sales
1.8	---	10.8	---	9.8	8.8	5.5	Service
---	1.6	2.5	---	---	2.9	1.2	Farming, forestry
.9	1.6	5.8	---	3.9	2.9	2.9	Processing
17.5	26.2	27.5	21.1	19.6	14.7	22.0	Machine trades
28.9	11.5	6.7	7.9	3.9	5.9	13.2	Bench work
8.8	9.8	17.5	7.9	3.9	5.9	10.5	Structural work
7.9	13.1	8.3	21.1	15.7	14.7	11.5	Transportation, miscellaneous

extent of training, recency of use, and individual preference. A more detailed listing of the codes comprising the "expanded" codes shown here is given in the appendix. Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

men in all groups were earning as much as, or more than, they had expected, including those in the lowest brackets. This may have reflected the steady rise in pay in all sectors of the civilian market while the men were in service.

Did the group feel that the factors for success on civilian jobs were different from those for the Air Force? The officers, most of whom were in professional, technical, and managerial jobs, rated ability to communicate, job knowledge, and formal education as more essential on their civilian jobs than in the Air Force. Interestingly, administrative skills became less important in civilian life. The enlisted men, unlike the officers, gave lower ratings to all of these elements of success except formal education when they compared their civilian with their military jobs. Both groups thought success in their civilian jobs was little affected by social skills or knowing the politics of the organization.

While the responses differ slightly from those previously given for their Air Force jobs, they seem to indicate that the factors for job success in both the military and civilian sectors are similar and the experience in the one should be helpful in making the change-over to the other.

TABLE 3. REPORTED ANNUAL INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES
(Number reporting)

Annual income	Officers			Enlisted Men		
	Scientific–engineering	Administrative–managerial	Total	Crafts–technical	Military services	Total
Under $3,000	5	2	7	16	11	27
$3,000—$4,999	5	6	11	28	23	51
$5,000—$7,499	21	42	63	168	58	226
$7,500—$9,999	70	91	161	60	17	77
$10,000—$14,999	93	46	139	9	8	17
$15,000 and over	22	10	32	2	0	2
No response	15	12	27	12	6	18
Average income	$10,480	$9,191	$9,864	$6,800	$6,151	$6,433

In response to another question repeated for comparison purposes, the group said that civilian employers were utilizing their skills and abilities to a greater extent than the Air Force did. Over half of both officers and enlisted men thought they were now being utilized "a great deal." Only one-third felt that the Air Force had done so.

HOW WELL ARE MILITARY SKILLS BEING TRANSFERRED TO CIVILIAN OCCUPATIONS?

A study cited by Major Richardson found that 85 percent of all enlisted men's career jobs have counterparts in civilian occupations, and at least 1,500 different civilian jobs are represented in the hundreds of Armed Forces training courses examined during the study. As of 1963, the Defense Department reports that skilled occupational fields—electronics, technical, or mechanics skills—comprised nearly 50 percent of all enlisted men's skills. Only 14 percent of the enlisted force were assigned to combat duties, for which the skills could not be transferred. In the Air Force, that figure dropped to 9 percent. Officer skills, another source indicates, closely resemble those of executives and administrators at a similar level in civilian industry.

If this is true, how well did the study group benefit from the similarity between the military and civilian occupations? Major Richardson split this question into two parts:

1. How much does military experience contribute to the *qualifications* of the civilian applicant; that is, help him get the job?

2. Once he is hired, what contribution do his skills make to the *actual performance* of the job?

On the first question, 64 percent of the officers said that their military service had helped "somewhat" or "a great deal," while 13 percent felt that it had been of "no help" or a "hindrance." (See table 4.) Of the crafts group of enlisted men, 30 percent reported that it had "helped a great deal," but in the military services group, only 15 percent thought so. Almost half of this latter group said that their military experience had been of "no help" or a "hindrance," as against 28 percent of the men with technical specialties.

As for the performance of their civilian jobs, approximately 40 percent of both the officers and enlisted men said there was no need for their military training and experience. In the enlisted group, half of the nontechnically trained men, as would be expected, reported no need.

On the basis of these and other responses, Major Richardson concluded that skill transfers do take place, but on a selective basis. Enlisted men with certain technical skills were generally able to utilize them in civilian jobs. The picture was less clear for officers. Many of them, it will be recalled, had been assigned directly to jobs related to their major academic field without further training. Most of the officers reported that the principal benefit came from the managerial and administrative experience they acquired in those assignments. For the scientific-engineering officers, such experience was not always immediately beneficial. When they returned to civilian jobs, usually in their major fields, they found themselves "somewhat rusty" and behind their civilian coworkers. They did expect to benefit later from

their experience as executives. The administrative-managerial group, on the other hand, felt that their skills had been sharpened by their military experience.

TABLE 4. USAF EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING AS QUALIFYING FACTORS FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT
(Percent distribution)

Influence of USAF background on qualification for civilian work	Officers			Enlisted Men		
	Scientific–engineering	Administrative–managerial	Total	Crafts–technical	Military services	Total
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Helped great deal	33.8	32.1	33.0	30.2	14.6	25.6
Helped somewhat	29.4	32.5	30.9	22.0	20.3	21.5
Helped very little	16.5	16.0	16.4	15.9	13.0	15.1
No help	10.0	10.5	10.2	27.1	44.7	32.3
Hindrance	3.9	2.4	3.2	.7	3.3	1.4
No response	6.5	6.2	6.4	4.1	4.1	4.1

Note: Detailing may not add to totals due to rounding.

While transferability of military skills and experience will undoubtedly continue to increase, several barriers are tending to block its progress:

1. Differences in job titles and descriptions. In some instances, noticeable gaps exist between military and civilian titles, and, quite frequently, no direct conversion can be made from a military to a civilian job title. For example, the Air Force specialty of munitions/weapons maintenance (really a weapons mechanic) is enough of a title to mislead or even scare off any civilian employer. On the face of it, the job appears to have no transferability, yet the technical knowledge required to repair intricate weapons could be applied to many civilian jobs. Apparently, the mechanics themselves did not realize this, for, in answer to one of the survey questions, 49 percent reported no need for their military skills. Fortunately, most of them did find jobs in bench work and machine trades. A similar problem may arise with many other military occupations.

With some job titles, the opposite may be true. The narrow scope of many of the courses and specialties may leave the veteran with limited background and experience in his occupational field, which may, by its title, appear to be similar to a job in civilian industry. For example, the Air Force has nearly 70 "job ladders" in electronics maintenance and the training courses may be geared accordingly.

2. Educational attainment. As jobs grow more complex, the need for more education becomes greater. However, many employers specify a certain level of education as a hiring standard, without considering whether it is necessary in the performance of the job being filled.

3. The current job market. An oversupply in his field at the time of discharge will naturally limit an ex-serviceman's chances of finding employment. For example, the number of aircraft mechanics leaving service in the 1957–63 period was greater than the number already in civilian industry.

4. Seniority, union rules, other restrictions. To illustrate: In one recent study, it was found that numbers of ex-military pilots were unemployed because of commercial airline seniority rules. Qualified, highly experienced fliers were required to start on a semi-apprentice basis at comparatively low pay. Or a Navy electrician's mate may not be familiar with the building code requirements for a particular area and may be required to start as an apprentice, possibly with some allowance for his military experience.

5. Unwillingness to locate in another part of the country. Many veterans return to their hometowns, although jobs may be more plentiful or pay more in other parts of the country.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Briefly, these are the most significant of Major Richardson's findings:

1. The men in his study made the transition to civilian employment rather easily, probably with the help of a booming job market. They did so with comparatively little use of organized employment services, public or private. The officers generally had the least trouble, probably because of good planning and superior qualifications. The technically trained enlisted men did quite well, too, despite the lack of planning. About 15 percent of the enlisted men—the nontechnically trained group, generally assigned to military occupations with limited carryover value—had difficulty. Their civilian jobs were usually in low-paying service occupations.

2. A large percentage of the study group was dissatisfied with both the training and the way their skills and abilities were utilized while in service. Many of the officers were assigned directly to jobs related to their major academic fields or to administrative duties. They did gain experience, which, in some cases, they were able to use in civilian jobs. The enlisted men who received technical training had an opportunity to acquire a marketable skill. But neither the officers nor the enlisted men thought that the Air Force made much use of their skills.

3. When they left the service, the technically trained enlisted men generally found bench work, electrician, machinist, and structural work jobs; the others worked in sales, service, and miscellaneous occupations. The scientific and other technically trained officers generally returned to their major fields. Transfer from military skills and experience to civilian occupations apparently took place on a selective basis and depended on the skills involved. The men regarded their education level as a more potent factor in the job hunt than their military training and experience.

4. Most of the men did as well as they had expected, financially. The average pay for enlisted men was about $6,500; for officers, $10,000. Some, including enlisted men, were earning $15,000 or more.

5. Both officers and men found jobs, for the most part, with large companies. The majority of the men had had only one job since their discharge and were satisfied with it. The higher the skill and the educational level, the greater the stability and job satisfaction. Most of the men felt that their civilian employers were utilizing their skills better than the Air Force had.

Major Richardson suggests to employers two criteria in judging a veteran's qualifications: If he is an officer, he probably has a good educational background, backed up by 4 years or more of military experience, which may include skill in administration or management. If he is an Air Force enlisted man with a Primary Air Force Specialty Code in technical skills or crafts, he can probably qualify as a technician, mechanic, or machinist with minimal training.

A number of his recommendations for Government actions, in effect, anticipated the initiation of new programs, as will be seen in the following chapter. His recommendations include:

1. The Department of Defense and the Department of Labor should work together on a national program of manpower planning which takes into account all discharged servicemen. In some job categories—aircraft mechanic, for example—ex-servicemen may be able to supply the future needs of the civilian economy.

2. The two Departments should also cooperate in establishing on a permanent basis a program of employment assistance for all men who are leaving the service. Special attention should be given to those who have had no military skill training and who have been assigned to military occupations that offer limited carryover into civilian jobs.

3. Information on employment opportunities in all parts of the country should be made available to new veterans. Men of this age group usually have few ties to hold them to one part of the country and might be willing to migrate to take jobs. Mobility by a group of this size might be useful in the job market.

4. The Armed Forces should work together with civilian industries in developing and utilizing manpower. As technology brings the two sectors closer together, such cooperation can go far in strengthening the transferability process. The problem of transferability is important enough to merit the best efforts of these two major forces in our national economy.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE COMPLETION OF THE STUDY

Beginning in 1966, both military and civilian authorities have displayed an increasing awareness of the problem of transferability. In a message to the Congress on servicemen and veterans on January 30, 1968, President Johnson summarized what had been done and proposed several new programs. "Our objective," he said, "is to make sure that every serviceman who returns to civilian life . . . will have the education he wants, the training he needs, and the opportunities for the job he is best suited for."

To this end, the President outlined the following new measures:

1. He announced that he had directed the Veterans' Administration to establish one-stop assistance centers "where a veteran can receive personal attention and counsel on all the benefits the law provides him—from housing to health, from education to employment." Accordingly, the Veterans' Administration announced during the week of February 19, 1968, that it had opened United States Veterans' Assistance Centers (USVAC) in 10 large cities and that centers would be opened in 10 other cities during March. These centers offer counseling and other services in employment, health, housing, and education. They are staffed by full-time representatives of the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Labor, and the Civil Service Commission, with staffing from other agencies as needed. The President said he would seek and welcome participation by State and local officials and community groups.

2. The President asked for Congressional action on three matters: (a) Legislation to liberalize educational and training benefits for ex-servicemen who volunteer to help teach the children of the poor, help man understaffed police and fire departments, take jobs in shortage-troubled hospitals, or work in various new job-training and antipoverty programs; (b) legislation to permit service-disabled veterans to take vocational rehabilitation on a part-time basis, as well as the full-time programs already authorized; and (c) a joint resolution expressing the "sense of Congress" that private employers should give job priority to returning servicemen.

3. The President also announced that he would order Federal agencies to hire veterans with no more than a high school education on a priority basis, without examination, for jobs in the first five Civil Service grades, provided they agree to take part-time education or training under the GI bill of rights. This action was taken in Executive Order 11397.

In his review of actions already taken, the President indicated that nearly 400,000 men and women were taking advantage of the educational assistance available to them under the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. More complete data from the Veterans' Admin-

istration show that almost 1 million applications for educational assistance were received between June 1966, when this provision of the act went into effect, and the end of February 1968. Nearly 700,000 had taken training, and the 400,000 referred to by the President were still in training.

The President also reported that the Armed Forces had, since Project 100,000 was set up by the Department of Defense in late 1966, accepted and trained about 49,000 young men who would previously have been rejected because of educational or physical limitations. Ninety-six percent of them successfully completed basic training. In 1968, it is anticipated that 100,000 men will be accepted for service under this program.

President Johnson also reported that another Department of Defense program—Project Transition—was to be expanded. This program was initiated in August 1967 to provide educational and training opportunities for specified groups of men during their final months of service in order to prepare them for civilian employment. Building on the experience accumulated in pilot projects at five military bases during 1967, the program has been extended to 238 military bases during 1968. The aim is to provide some counseling service to 500,000 returning servicemen and to offer training or education to approximately 150,000 each year. Placement help will also be given.

Participation in Project Transition is voluntary. Priority is given to men disabled in combat, those unable to reenlist, those with no civilian work experience, and those who did not acquire any military skills which could be used on a civilian job. Among the main targets are men accepted for service in Project 100,000, some of whom will be eligible for discharge in 1968, and former residents of slums, where few jobs are to be found.

The men who enroll will begin their programs 1 to 6 months before separation. They will receive counseling to help them choose the most suitable courses from the wide range to be offered. Among the offerings will be:

Mechanics and Repairmen Occupations

- Aircraft Mechanic
- Air Conditioning Repairman
- Auto Body Repairman
- Automotive Mechanic
- Electrical Appliance Repairman
- Farm Equipment Mechanic
- Office Machine Repairman
- Radio and TV Repairman

Clerical and Sales Occupations

- Accounting Clerk
- Automatic Data Processing Machine Operator
- Bookkeeper
- Clerk Typist
- Computer Programer
- Post Office Worker
- Retail Salesman

Food Occupations

- Baker
- Cook
- Meat Cutter

Medical Occupations

- Hospital Attendant
- Practical Nurse
- Medical Technician

Construction and Structural Occupations

- Welder
- Carpenter
- Construction Equipment Operator
- Electrician
- Plumber
- Sheet Metal Worker

Machine Trades Occupations

- Lathe Operator
- Milling Machine Operator
- Machinist

Miscellaneous Occupations

- Electronics Technician
- Draftsman
- Law Enforcement Officer
- Printing Pressman

The men are allowed time off, consistent with mission requirements, from regular duties to attend the courses, which are given on or off base depending on the facilities available. The courses may include military on-the-job or formal school training in civilian skills; on- or off-base Manpower Development and Training Act courses sponsored by the Department of Labor or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Federal agency training programs; and courses conducted on or off

base to meet specific requirements by private industry, unions, or local government agencies such as police departments. In addition to training courses, men are offered educational programs designed to bring them to the equivalency of eighth grade or high school completion or to provide individual courses, such as shop math, to enhance their skill training.

When the men complete training, they will receive placement help. Efforts will be made to secure employment for them on the base; in local, State, or Federal civil service; or in private industry. The U.S. Employment Service will help in placing the men. Plans are being made for followup to see what educational or employment progress the men have made since leaving service.

The President also reported progress by the Department of Labor in a program set up in August 1967 whereby the State Employment Service takes the initiative in offering employment help to all newly separated veterans. The Labor Department has arranged with the Defense Department for the State agencies to be notified about veterans who are separated from service and are returning to their home States.

Labor Department forms providing information about the veteran's military skills and occupations as well as other data are sent to the State Employment Service. The State agency then tries to arrange for a letter from the Governor welcoming the ex-serviceman home. The State Administrator also writes him offering the services of the local Employment Office in securing employment, job training, and other assistance, and staff members follow up by inviting him to visit the office.

Interviewers study all the military and civilian job duties the veteran has performed and try to classify him according to his highest skills, recognizing that direct conversion of military job titles to civilian classifications is not necessarily correct or sufficient. Employers who are able to hire veterans are canvassed, and every effort is made to find jobs for veterans from minority groups.

The Pennsylvania State Employment Agency, using these techniques, successfully conducted a statewide followup of its recently discharged servicemen. Followup campaigns like this have made the names and addresses of 230,000 veterans available to employment offices and have achieved good results, the President reported.

Special efforts are being made in this program to enroll veterans with military training in health occupations. In addition to contacting these veterans, the employment offices canvass hospitals to see what jobs they have open and ask the hospitals to notify them about new job opportunities and in-hospital training programs. In some cases, hospitals may be urged to restructure their job requirements and provide on-the-job training opportunities for individuals whose skills are less than those needed for a particular job.

These efforts are supplemented, through Project Remed, by the activities of several other agencies. State Offices of Education are compiling lists of schools and other institutions offering training in health occupations for State Employment Offices, Veterans' Administration field offices, and other agencies. New Jersey, for example, listed nearly 100 such facilities—high schools and vocational schools, technical institutes, colleges and universities, hospitals, private schools, and manpower training skill centers. Educational institutions will be encouraged to give as much credit as possible for the veteran's military training in considering his eligibility. Each veteran will also receive a personal letter from the U.S. Commissioner of Education urging him to go into civilian health work.

The U.S. Office of Education has also suggested to hospitals that, as they are presently organized, many of their jobs will not attract veterans. The are being urged to improve career opportunities and take other steps to make them more desirable.

Special attempts are also underway to interest prospective veterans in joining local police departments, many of which are either dangerously undermanned or staffed by men who are not fully qualified. In some cases (the District of Columbia, for example), civilian police recruiting officers have been able to sign up and give preemployment tests to military policemen several months before they were to be discharged.

Thus far, however, recruiting efforts have been limited, perhaps by several unattractive features of police work. One is the low pay offered in many places. Another is a local resi-

dence rule which some communities maintain, despite the difficulty in recruiting candidates. Still another is the slow-moving and inflexible machinery of the civil service systems in many of the large cities. Despite these barriers, aggressive recruiting could probably induce many returning servicemen to become civilian police.

As noted earlier in this monograph, transferability of military skills to civilian jobs is not always easy, but measures such as those outlined above can do much to improve their utilization.

APPENDIX

The Sample Group

Major Richardson used only U.S. Air Force personnel as his research group for these reasons: (1) His 15 years' experience as an Air Force officer permitted him to design the research without a preliminary study; (2) the Air Force is considered the most technical of the services and would, therefore, be more closely oriented to the industrial sector of the civilian economy; and (3) confining the study to the one service narrowed its scope to manageable proportions.

In order to be able to report on the recent experience of a homogeneous group, he chose only men who had voluntarily left the Air Force during 1965 and 1966, after satisfying their minimum military obligation (usually 4 years' service).

The scope of the study was further limited to men whose military jobs fell in specified "skill clusters": for officers, scientific-engineering and administrative-managerial; and for enlisted men, crafts-technical and military services. The two-digit Primary Air Force Specialty Codes [1] encompassed by these skill clusters are as follows:

Officers

Scientific-Engineering Cluster

23—Audio-Visual-Photo
25—Weather
26—Scientific
28—Engineering
30—Communications
31—Missiles
32—Avionics
43—Maintenance
47—Munitions
55—Civil Engineering
57—Cartographic-Geodetic

Administrative-Managerial Cluster

60—Transportation
62—Supply Services
63—Fuels
64—Supply Operations
65—Procurement
66—Logistics
67—Accounting-Finance
68—Data Systems
70—Administration
73—Personnel
74—Manpower
75—Education-Training
79—Information

Enlisted Personnel

Technical-Craftsmen Cluster

31—Missile Electronics
32—Armament
46—Munitions Maintenance
53—Metal Working
54—Facilities
55—Construction
56—Utilities
57—Fire Protection
58—Fabric-Leather-Rubber
59—Marine

Nontechnical (Military Services) Cluster

60—Transportation
62—Food Service
71—Printing
74—Special Services
77—Air Police
92—Aircrew Protection

Some 2,000 officers and 18,000 enlisted men in these skill clusters were estimated to have been voluntarily separated from the Air Force in 1965–66. From Air Force records, a sample

[1] The AFSC for officers is a 4-digit number: the first digit is career area, the second utilization field, the third specialty, and the fourth skill level (four levels possible). For enlisted men, it is a 5-digit number: the first two digits denote career field, the third shows the specific skill, the fourth skill level (five possible), and the fifth, the general type of the specific skills.

group of about 400 men was picked from each skill cluster. The size of the groups was chosen to limit the maximum standard error of any percentage in the frequency distributions which were to be used in the analysis to 5 percent with a 95 percent confidence limit. In simpler terms, this means that if 50 percent (where the error based on sample enumerations is largest) of the men in any sample group reported a certain characteristic, the chances are 95 out of 100 that if all men in that skill cluster were surveyed, somewhere between 45 and 55 percent of them would report the specified characteristic.

However, since current addresses could not be obtained for some of the men and others (about 30 percent of those for whom addresses were correct) failed to respond, the study is based on information obtained by mail questionnaire (see p. 27) from 440 officers and 418 enlisted men. The reliability of the resulting data is acceptable by prevailing statistical standards.

Limitations of the Study

1. The Air Force comprises only 27 percent of the Armed Forces enrollment (as of December 31, 1966) and is more technical than other branches of the service and has higher enlistment standards. Hence, a study of other services might have produced different findings from those reported here.

2. Even within the Air Force, the findings might have been different for men in other skill clusters.

3. As with all mail surveys, the higher the educational level, the greater the response. The officers (college graduates) replied at a 79-percent rate as against 62 percent for the enlisted men (high school graduates). In the enlisted group, the Air Force Qualifying Test classification of those responding was higher than that of the nonresponders. The percentage of response from the non-whites was noticeably lower than that of the whole group—33 percent against 69 percent—which might suggest the possibility of some bias along racial lines.

4. The experiences and opinions of the men, but not of their civilian employers, were studied. The findings on civilian employment experiences may therefore be biased.

5. The sample group were in their civilian jobs less than 2 years, a comparatively short period on which to judge employment experiences. The findings after a few more years of civilian employment might have been more definitive.

6. Anonymity was not guaranteed the recipients of the questionnaire. Thus, the responses to some of the questions might have been along socially acceptable lines.

Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS: Place an "X" in the appropriate box or boxes following each question. The numbers following each possible answer and those appearing in the right column are for coding purposes and should be ignored. Please feel free to clarify or qualify any of your answers by writing in your comments in the margins of the questionnaire. The last page of the questionnaire has been intentionally left blank for your use in making any additional comments you feel would be useful to our study.

NOTE: If you have served more than one active duty tour in the U.S. Air Force, consider only your most recent tour for the purposes of this questionnaire.

1. Please indicate the highest level of formal schooling you had *completed* prior to entering the USAF, upon separation from active military service, and as of today.

Education Level (years)	Upon Entry USAF	At Time of Exit from USAF	As of Today
Elementary (1–8)	___0	___0	___0
Some High School (9–11)	___1	___1	___1
High School Graduate or passed GED (12)	___2	___2	___2
Some College (13–15)	___3	___3	___3
College Graduate or passed GED (16)	___4	___4	___4
Graduate Level Work (17 or more)	___5	___5	___5

Answer the following question only if you attended college for at least three years. All others proceed to question #2.

1a. If you completed at least three years of college, what was your major field of study?

Agriculture	___0	Social/Behavioral Sciences	___5
Business	___1	Humanities/Arts	___6
Education	___2	Health/Natural Sciences	___7
Engineering	___3	Other (specify major field)	___8
Physical Science	___4	_____	

2. Considering all of your assignments while serving with the USAF, how important was your formal schooling to the performance of your duties?

Most important	___0
Very important	___1
Of some importance	___2
No importance	___3
Hindered me in doing job	___4

3. What was your marital status prior to entering USAF, upon separation from active duty, and as of today?

Status	Enter USAF	Separate USAF	Today
Single	___0	___0	___0
Married—0 children	___1	___1	___1
Married—1 child	___2	___2	___2
Married—2 or more children	___3	___3	___3
Divorced/Separated	___4	___4	___4
Widowed	___5	___5	___5

4. Please indicate the general geographic region associated with each of the six particular points in your life shown below.

Region	Your Birthplace	Where Living When Entered USAF	Place of Separation from USAF	First Residence after Separation	Current Residence	Wife's Home at Time of Marriage
						___7 (not married)
NORTHEAST (Me–NH–Vt–Mass–Conn–Del–RI–NY–NJ–Penn–DC–Md)	___0	___0	___0	___0	___0	___0
SOUTHEAST (Va–W. Va–Tenn–NC–SC–Ala–Ga–Fla)	___1	___1	___1	___1	___1	___1
NORTH CENTRAL (Ohio–Ill–Ind–Ky–Wis–Mich–Minn–Ia–ND–SD–Neb)	___2	___2	___2	___2	___2	___2
SOUTH CENTRAL (Ark–Miss–La–Tex–Okla–Kans–Mo)	___3	___3	___3	___3	___3	___3
NORTHWEST (Ore–Wash–Idaho–Mont–Wyo)	___4	___4	___4	___4	___4	___4
SOUTHWEST (NM–Ariz–Calif–Nev–Utah–Colo)	___5	___5	___5	___5	___5	___5
OUTSIDE U.S. (Ala–Haw–Other)	___6	___6	___6	___6	___6	___6

5. At the time you first entered on active duty with the U.S. Air Force, what did you consider to be your primary civilian occupation?

_____00 None—I was a student or had completed school but was not employed before entering the USAF.
(Go on to Question #6)
I was a _____
_____(01–99)
(Write in your civilian occupation and go on to Queston 5a)

a. What was the primary source for attaining the skills needed for the civilian occupation listed above?

High School	____0	Apprenticeship	____4
College	____1	Company Training Course	____5
Trade, Business, or Technical School	____2	Learned from friend or relative	____6
On-the-job training	____3	Other (explain)	____7

_____

6. What was your father's main occupation when you were 13–18 years old?
He was a _____
(Please write in the specific job he performed)

7. Which one of the following reasons best explains why you initially chose the U.S. Air Force for military service?

Interest in aviation	____0	Preferred it to other services	____4
Training and educational opportunities	____1	Only service represented at my high school or college	____5
Advice of friends or relatives	____2	Other (explain) _____	____6
Chance of travel	____3		

_____

8. How much do you feel the USAF utilized your skills and abilities in your military assignments?

A great deal	____0
Somewhat	____1
Very little	____2
Not at all	____3

9. Please indicate below any formal USAF training courses or military schools (other than basic or orientation training) which you completed while on active duty.

Course/School	Length (weeks)	Year Completed

10. In the duties you performed the most while in the USAF, what kinds of tasks were you required to devote most of your time to? (For example, typing, standing alert, making reports,

meetings, etc.) List the three tasks to which you devoted the most time in order of their importance.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

11. How important would you rate *each* of the following to success in the Air Force in terms of *your* experiences while on active duty?

	No Need	Very Necessary	Absolutely Essential	Some Need
Job knowledge	0	1	2	3
Formal education	0	1	2	3
Working well with others	0	1	2	3
Ability to speak and write	0	1	2	3
Knowing "politics" of unit	0	1	2	3
Administrative ability	0	1	2	3

12. Please check the highest level of USAF organization to which you were directly assigned while on active duty.

Hq. USAF	0	Wing	5
Joint/Unified Command	1	Squadron	6
Major Air Command	2	Separate Detachment	7
Numbered Air Force	3	Other (State)	8
Air Division	4	_____	

13. Which one of the following reasons best explains why you chose to separate from active duty with the U.S. Air Force?

Insufficient pay	0	Poor supervision/leadership	4
Limited promotions	1	Dislike military life	5
Inadequate living conditions	2	Skills/abilities not fully utilized	6
Frequent family separations	3	Other (explain) _____	7

14. Are you currently employed for 15 hours a week or more?

YES, and I am *not* a full time student as well. 0
(Please turn page and continue with Question 16)
YES, but I am also a full time student. 1
(Please turn page and continue with Question 16)
NO (Please continue with Question 15 below) 2

Only those who answered "No" to the preceding question should answer the remaining questions on this page; all others turn page and continue with question 16.

15. Have you ever been employed for 15 hours a week or more since your separation from active duty?

YES, but I am *now* a full time *student.* 0
(Please turn page and continue with Question 16:

Answer the questions on the basis of the work you were doing before you became a full time student.)

YES, but I am now *unemployed* and *not* a full time student. ____1
(Please turn page and answer Questions 16–22, 28, 32, 35 and 36 only.)

NO (Please answer Question 15a below and disregard the remainder of the questionnaire.) ____2

a. Please tell us why you feel that you have been unable to secure satisfactory employment since your return to civilian life. Upon completion of this question, we would appreciate your mailing this questionnaire to us at your earliest convenience using the enclosed postage paid envelope. Thank you for your participation in this survey and good luck to you in your job hunt efforts.

The next nine questions are related to your experiences in seeking satisfactory employment after separation from active duty.

16. In relation to your estimated separation date from active duty, when did you start planning what you would do when you returned to civilian life?

More than 6 months in advance	____0
3–6 months in advance	____1
1–3 months in advance	____2
Made no specific plans	____3
Had always been planning for it	____4

17. Did you receive any professional counseling help in making your plans for civilian employment?

No and would have liked some	____0
No and didn't need any	____1
Yes—through USAF	____2
Yes—through private counseling service	____3
Yes—through State Employment Service	____4
Yes—other (specify) _____	____5

18. Please tell us how much you used *each* of the following in locating your first job after separation. (Please enter check in appropriate column for *each* item; if no use was made of a particular group or service, place a check in the right hand column)

	Used Heavily	Used Somewhat	No Use Made
Veterans' organizations	____0	____1	____2
Religious groups	____0	____1	____2
Labor unions	____0	____1	____2
Mailing résumés to potential employers	____0	____1	____2
Military or ex-military friends	____0	____1	____2
Other friends or relatives	____0	____1	____2
Advertisements in newspapers	____0	____1	____2
Private employment agencies	____0	____1	____2
State Employment Service	____0	____1	____2
College placement services	____0	____1	____2
Personal application to employers	____0	____1	____2
Other (specify) _____	____0	____1	____2

19. How many full-time civilian jobs have you held since your separation from the USAF?

One	___0
Two	___1
Three	___2
Four	___3
Five or more	___4

20. Please indicate what type of jobs you have held since leaving the USAF.

a. Current job _____
b. First job after separation (if different from current) _____
c. Second job after separation (if different from current) _____

21. Compared to your expectations at the time of your separation, how easy or difficult would you say it was for you to find your current job? (or your first job after separation if you are now unemployed?)

Much easier than I expected	___0
It was fairly easy, and that's what I expected	___1
It was fairly difficult, and that's what I expected	___2
It was much more difficult than I expected.	___3

22. What is your average total annual income from all sources at present?

Under $3000	___0
$3000–4999	___1
$5000–7499	___2
$7500–9999	___3
$10000–1499	___4
$15000 and over	___5

a. How does this income compare with what you thought you would be earning at the time you separated from the USAF?

Much greater	___0
Somewhat greater	___1
About what I expected	___2
Less than I expected	___3
Much less than I expected	___4

23. How satisfied are you with your current job?

Satisfied—not looking for another job (turn page—go to Q. 24)	___0
Satisfied, but interested in finding another job (answer Q. 23a)	___1
Not satisfied—not looking for another job (turn page—go to Q. 24)	___2
Not satisfied—looking for another job (answer Q. 23a)	___3

a. If you are interested in or are looking for another job, please tell us which one of the following conditions would be most important to you in deciding upon a change.

More money	___0	Educational opportunity	___4
Increased responsibility	___1	Chance to travel	___5

Change of geographical location	___2	Learn new skill	___6
Work for larger company	___3	More security	___7
		Other (explain) _____	___8

You are now ⅔ the way through the questionnaire. These last 12 questions are related to your current job experiences.

24. How many employees do you have working for you in your current job? (Include all employees for whom you have overall responsibility)
_____(Number)

25. How important was your formal educational level in getting your current job?

Most important	___0
Very important	___1
Of some importance	___2
No importance	___3
Don't know	___4

26. Compared to other civilians who are doing the same kind of work you are, how qualified do you think you are?

Much better qualified	___0
Somewhat better qualified	___1
About the same qualifications	___2
Less qualified	___3
Much less qualified	___4

27. How important would you rate *each* of the following in successfully performing your present job?

	No Need	Very Necessary	Absolutely Essential	Some Need
Formal education	___0	___1	___2	___3
Ability to speak and write	___0	___1	___2	___3
Technical (job) knowledge	___0	___1	___2	___3
Knowing "politics" of organization	___0	___1	___2	___3
Social skills	___0	___1	___2	___3
Managerial ability	___0	___1	___2	___3
Administrative skills	___0	___1	___2	___3
Ability to work with others	___0	___1	___2	___3
Leadership ability	___0	___1	___2	___3
Military training and experience	___0	___1	___2	___3

28. Has your USAF background helped qualify you for the work you have done and/or are doing in civilian life?

Helped a great deal	___0
Helped somewhat	___1
Helped very little	___2
Has not helped at all	___3
Has hindered me	___4

29. How much do you feel your employer is utilizing your skills and abilities in your current job?

A great deal	____0
Somewhat	____1
Very little	____2
Not at all	____3
Not applicable—self-employed	____4

30. Please list the three types of tasks to which you are required to devote most of your time in the daily performance of your current job (i.e., selling, teaching, correspondence, conferences, etc.).

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

31. At what level of organization are you currently holding a job?

Not applicable—self-employed	____0
International offices	____1
National or Federal headquarters	____2
State government or agency	____3
Corporate or regional headquarters	____4
Company or plant	____5
Field office or detachment	____6
Local business or branch	____7
Other (explain) _____	____8

32. Since your separation from the USAF, have you taken any vocational or job training?

No (Go on to Q. 23)	____0
Yes (Go on to part a below)	____1

a. If "yes" please describe the training in terms of that most recently completed, next most recent, etc.

What trained for?	Duration (weeks)	Who sponsored the training
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

33. Please check the appropriate type of employer for whom you are now employed.

Not applicable—self-employed (Go on to Q. 34)	____0
Large business (over 1000 employees)	____1
Medium business (50–1000 employees)	____2
Small business (less than 50 employees)	____3
Government (Federal, State, or local)	____4
College, university, technical school	____5
Secondary or elementary school	____6
Other private or public institution (please specify) _____	____7

34. What kind of work does this employer do? Please explain briefly. (If self-employed, what is your main product or service?)

35. Looking back at your change from military to civilian life, how would you rate the need for assistance in each of the following areas in order to improve a person's chances of securing a satisfactory job?

	Need Somewhat More	Need Much More	No Need
USAF pre-separation counseling	0	1	2
Job availability information	0	1	2
Professional counseling	0	1	2
Employment Service assistance	0	1	2
Vocational or job training	0	1	2
Formal education	0	1	2
Other (specify) _____	0	1	2

36. Please tell us how your military service has helped or hindered you in all of your civilian employment experiences since separation from active duty.

You have completed the questionnaire. If you desire to offer any additional comments, the next page has been provided for that purpose. Thank you for your participation in this study. We would appreciate your returning this questionnaire to us at your earliest convenience using the enclosed postage paid envelope.

DISSERTATIONS PREPARED UNDER RESEARCH GRANTS FROM THE MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THROUGH MAY 1, 1968

All dissertations prepared under research grants from the Manpower Administration may be purchased from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Virginia 22151, at $3 for each paper copy and 65 cents for each microfiche copy. Send order with remittance (check or Clearinghouse coupon) and specify accession number of the desired report, as shown below.

Doctoral candidate and institution awarding degree	Title of dissertation	Grant number	Accession number
Gerald Eugene Boggs Oklahoma State University	A Comparative Analysis of the Impact of Various Types of Curricula on the Vocational Success of School Dropouts	91–38–66–50	PB 177 776
Malcolm S. Cohen Massachusetts Institute of Technology	The Determinants of the Relative Supply and Demand for Unskilled Workers	91–23–66–36	PB 177 554
	Statistical Appendix		PB 177 555
James S. Crabtree University of Wisconsin	The Structure of Related Instruction in Wisconsin Apprenticeship Programs	91–53–66–11	PB 177 567
Richard B. Freeman Harvard University	The Labor Market for College Manpower	91–23–66–15	PB 178 704
Leonard J. Hausman University of Wisconsin	The 100% Welfare Tax Rate: Its Incidence and Effects	91–53–66–68	PB 177 566

Doctoral candidate and institution awarding degree	Title of dissertation	Grant number	Accession number
Leonard Emil Kreider Ohio State University	The Development and Utilization of Managerial Talent: A Case Study of Manufacturing Managers in Columbus, Ohio	91–37–66–13	PB 178 351
Garland Frank Lawlis Texas Technological College	Motivational Aspects of the Chronically Unemployed	91–46–67–47	PB 178 774
Daniel Quinn Mills Harvard University	Factors Determining Patterns of Employment and Unemployment in the Construction Industry of the United States	91–23–67–08	PB 177 562
Robert Brooks Richardson Cornell University	An Examination of the Transferability of Certain Military Skills and Experience to Civilian Occupations	91–34–66–47	PB 177 372
Daniel C. Rogers Yale University	Private Rates of Return to Education in the United States: A Case Study	91–07–66–06	PB 177 557
Joan H. Rytina Michigan State University	The Ideology of American Stratification	91–24–66–45	PB 178 305
Jon M. Shepard Michigan State University	Man-Machine Relationships, Attitudes Toward Work and Meanings in the Work Role	91–24–67–03	PB 178 467
Arie Shirom University of Wisconsin	Industrial Cooperation and Adjustment to Technological Change: A Study of Joint Management-Union Committees	91–53–67–20	PB 177 565
Gaylen R. Wallace Oklahoma State University	An Analysis of Job Satisfaction of Employed Youth Involved in an Experimental School Dropout Rehabilitation Program	91–38–66–12	PB 177 546

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1968 O—317–601

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

Additional copies of this publication may be obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration in Washington, D.C. or from the Department's Regional Information Offices at the addresses listed below.

John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Boston,
Massachusetts 02203
341 Ninth Avenue, New York, New York 10001
1015 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
1371 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309
51 SW. First Avenue, Miami, Florida 33130
801 Broad Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
1240 E. Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44199
219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604
911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106
411 North Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75201
19th and Stout Street, Denver, Colorado 80202
300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102
506 Second Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104

For more information on manpower programs and services in your area, get in touch with your local Employment Service Office or the nearest Office of the Regional Manpower Administrator at the address listed below.

Location	States Serviced	
John F. Kennedy Fed. Bldg. Boston, Mass. 02203 Area Code 617, 223–6726	Connecticut Maine New Hampshire	Rhode Island Massachusetts Vermont
341 Ninth Avenue New York, N.Y. 10001 Area Code 212, 971–7564	New York New Jersey	Puerto Rico Virgin Islands
1111 20th Street, NW. Washington, D.C. 20210 Area Code 202, 386–6016	Delaware District of Columbia Maryland No. Carolina	Pennsylvania Virginia West Virginia
1371 Peachtree Street, NE. Atlanta, Ga. 30309 Area Code 404, 526–3267	Alabama Florida Georgia	Mississippi So. Carolina Tennessee
219 So. Dearborn Street Chicago, Ill. 60604 Area Code 312, 353–4258	Illinois Indiana Kentucky Michigan	Minnesota Ohio Wisconsin
911 Walnut Street Kansas City, Mo. 64106 Area Code 816, 374–3796	Colorado Iowa Kansas Missouri Montana	Nebraska No. Dakota So. Dakota Utah Wyoming
411 North Akard Street Dallas, Texas 75201 Area Code 214, 749–3671	Arkansas Louisiana New Mexico	Oklahoma Texas
450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, Calif. 94102 Area Code 415, 556–7414	Alaska Arizona California Hawaii	Idaho Nevada Oregon Washington